



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE PLOT OF MENANDER'S EPITREPONTES.

Although we now possess, in the Cairo papyrus alone, about 550 verses of the *Epitrepontes*, including one continuous stretch of 360 verses, a number of questions relating to the scenery, plot, and characters still remain uncertain. To our understanding of these matters Leo, *Rh. Mus.* 1908, pp. 120 ff., has contributed probably more than anyone else, but the evidence which was available for his use early in the year has proved insufficient to set at rest all divergent opinions—witness the latest edition, that of Robert, with its highly original ideas on all such matters. The position of Von Arnim's fragment R and that of the important Jernstedt fragment whose identification we owe to Van Leeuwen are uncertain, the interpretation of Q and consequently its position in the plot are still matters of dispute. In the following discussion I hope to show that the 22 lines of the Tischendorf fragment are to be assigned to this play; that it and the Jernstedt fragment belong near the end of the third Act, and that these, with R and NT, which Wilamowitz happily pieced together, constitute a series of Smicrines-scenes in the heart of the play; further, that Q¹ is continued by H³ and follows Q²; and finally that M, whose relation to the *Epitrepontes* has been shrewdly suspected but not proved, contained the interesting piece of dialogue *Men. frag.* 600 K., which Croiset assigned to the *Epitrepontes*, and comes from the first Act, perhaps from the very first scene, of the play. The results which flow from these conclusions, if they are found to be correct, affect materially our conception of the plot, the scenic arrangements, and the characters, and give us, it is to be hoped, a truer conception of the genius of Menander.¹

Let us begin with the Jernstedt fragment. The doubts which Van Leeuwen expressed in his first edition regarding the pertinence of this fragment to the *Epitrepontes* he has happily with-

¹ The restorations of the text of the fragments which I propose to assign to this play or to definite positions in it have appeared in the *Berl. phil. Woch.*, 1908, Nos. 38, 39. A fuller discussion of these, together with such modifications as are required by Körte's recent report on the papyrus or by other considerations, will appear in the next number of this Journal.

drawn in his second edition. He now prints it as the end of Act I. At first glance, and so long as only the part of Smicrines is recognized in this dialogue of three speakers, this assignment seems not unreasonable, for the words by which the Chorus is introduced give one the impression that this is its first appearance.¹ But, in the first place, the unknown speaker who introduces the Chorus here may not have seen these youth before, and, in the second place, he tells us that they are tipsy. We reflect that Charisius is giving a great banquet on this day, that the youth of the Chorus are his guests, that, as we are told in v. 165,² the guests are arriving, and finally that in the Jernstedt fragment they are already drunk. When they first appeared they were probably sober. A good deal of drinking is supposed to be going on behind the scenes as the action progresses; cf. vv. 305, 213. On this ground, therefore, we might reasonably assume that a group of young men, the invited guests, appear at the end of Act I and fill the intermission with singing and dancing, that they are somewhat more boisterous when they reappear, this time and later from the house where the banquet takes place, at the end of Act II, and that they are merrily tipsy when seen again at the end of, say, Act III. Still other reasons for a later position of the Jernstedt fragment will appear when we have identified the speakers.

Von Arnim places R¹ after NT¹ and R² after NT². In the absence of further light on the management of the plot this arrangement seemed fairly acceptable, though Leo, Hermes, p. 132, rather preferred to place this page in the first Act and Robert actually prints it there. NT¹ brings Smicrines on the scene from the city. He has acquired certain knowledge about the affairs of his daughter's household that puts him in a bad state of mind. Onesimus in fear retires from sight; it is clear that he knows Smicrines and probable that he has already had an interview with him in Act I. In R¹ we recognize Smicrines, who denounces the conduct of Charisius. So far there is no

¹ The identification of the Chorus is due to A. Körte *Hermes*, 1908, pp. 299 ff., and at length settles the problem of the Chorus in the New Comedy. The observation that -P- in the Jernstedt fragment represented $\chi\sigma\rho[\sigma\upsilon]$ is due to Blass, who called my attention to it in 1893; hence my statement in *Am. Jour. Arch.* 10, 1895, p. 320, n. 46. But my reference was to the wrong Tischendorf fragment.

² The play is generally cited here by the lines of Van Leeuwen's second edition

apparent objection to the sequence NT¹ and R¹. But in NT², which comes at the top of the next page after NT¹, somebody is talking about the Cook, perhaps to the Cook, and either he or the Cook is in distress about something. At the end of NT² Smicrines speaks; his name is in the margin though his words are lost. And finally R² seems to contain remarks of Smicrines on his favorite topic. Now the fact that Smicrines is present in all four of these fragments makes the view seem reasonable that they all belong to the same series of scenes. However, this is not certain so long as more substantial evidence that they do belong together is not at hand, for Smicrines was certainly present in Act I also. But assuming for the moment that R belongs to Act III, there are difficulties in placing R¹ after NT¹ and R² after NT². We naturally expect a tirade of considerable length from Smicrines immediately after his appearance ca. v. 367. But in the first seven verses of R¹ there is another speaker; for not only is a change of speakers indicated in the papyrus by the paragraphus under v. 7, but the use of the first person in vv. 6 and 7 (μέ and ἡμῖν) points to the presence of a second speaker. Between NT¹ and R¹ the interval could not be greater than 16 verses, and between R¹ and NT² the same maximum, greater or less according to the length of the preceding interval. In the former interval we should have to assume the entrance of the other person. He cannot be Onesimus (who has taken flight), nor Charisius (Smicrines uses the third person in referring to him). The only other male characters who can be considered are the Cook and Chaerestratus, the father of Charisius. Now the Cook would be a peculiarly inappropriate person to bring into conversation with Smicrines at this juncture. They can have no business together. And yet it seems to be he who appears a few lines later in NT². Chaerestratus, on the other hand, would very appropriately be brought into contact with Smicrines at this stage in the plot. But it would be very strange if the Cook, or talk about the Cook, interrupted the conversation of the two fathers within less than 26 lines of their appearance. And the chances are that Smicrines is given an opportunity of airing his feelings before Chaerestratus came in, so that the Cook would have to interrupt the fathers almost immediately after their meeting. Therefore, scanty as is the definite information which we derive from NT and R, we must acknowledge that serious objections are apparent to the arrangement NT¹-R¹-NT²-R².

To return for a moment to the Jernstedt fragment. Van Leeuwen is undoubtedly right in recognizing Smicrines¹ as the speaker in vv. 1-5. The other two he was unable to recognize, partly because he placed the fragment in Act I. As soon as it is removed from this position and placed, hypothetically, in the third Act, we see at once that the other two speakers are Chaerestratus and Onesimus respectively. Chaerestratus does not appear in the early part of the play, for Syricus is still waiting for his arrival in v. 161. Between v. 161 and v. 367 he does not appear. If he plays any part in the play at all, which has been doubted, it must have been in the second half of the play. As a matter of fact, it will be found that he is an important character in the plot and essential to its happy termination. If he is correctly recognized in the Jernstedt fragment, we have there the last words of his conversation with Smicrines. There is a manifest similarity between the tone of this conversation, so far as we can catch it, and that of R¹. The person who in R¹ is engaged in angry altercation with Smicrines is probably again Chaerestratus; cf. *ἡμῶν κεκήδ[ευκας]* in v. 7. In trying to determine the position of the latter we shall accordingly have to take the former into consideration also.

Now the Jernstedt fragment, of originally 20 verses, is written on one side of a strip of parchment which was once used in the binding of a book. A Russian palaeographer, the Bishop Porphyrius Uspenski, found it in 1850, we do not know where, and later gave it to the Public Library at St. Petersburg. It was first published in 1891 by Jernstedt.² Kock gives a copy in majuscules in *Rh. Mus.* 48 (1893), p. 234, and Kretschmar a transcript in his timely dissertation *De Menandri reliquiis nuper repertis* (Leipzig, 1906).³ Now Kock and Nauck state explicitly, on the

¹ Menander is fond of putting the same expressions repeatedly in the mouth of the same character. As *δεινὴ γ' ἡ κρίσις* is three times used by Davus (vv. 141, 144, 155; cf. *δεινὴ δίκη* in M²), so Smicrines uses *οἰμώζει* and *οἰμώζεται* again and again (R², 4?, R¹, 8, Tisch. 7, Jern. 1, v. 470). See Legrand's remarks *Rev. ét. anc.* 10, 1908, p. 31.

² The Porphyrius Fragments of Attic Comedy, St. Petersburg, 1891. Van Leeuwen refers to it as *Observationes palaeographicae et philologicae ad fragmenta comicorum Atticorum*.

³ One who has not access to Jernstedt's book must refer to Kock's copy or to Nauck, *Bemerkungen zu Kock's CAF.*, *Mélanges gréco-romains* VI, p. 155, as I have had to do, for Kretschmar does not indicate the extent of the lacunae. Some of Van Leeuwen's restorations are distinctly too long or too short for the available spaces.

authority of Jernstedt (see also Kretschmar, p. 119), that on the other side of this strip of parchment is written the interesting fragment which Tischendorf saw, in Uspenski's possession, in 1862, copied and sent to Cobet, who published it in *Mnemos.* 4 (1876), p. 286, after Tischendorf's death. It has been regarded as Menandrian by almost everybody but Kock, who put it among the adespota, No. 105, p. 421. Now if the recto (Jernstedt's 2a) belongs to the Epitrepontes, the chances are that the verso (Jernstedt's 2b) does also, unless Kock's discredited theory of a florilegium is to be revived. Both sides of another parchment strip from the same collection have been shown to contain verses from the *Phasma* (1a, 1b).¹ We shall see that the Tischendorf fragment is closely followed by R1 and that it brings the solution of many of the outstanding problems of the Epitrepontes.

The fragment consists of 14 almost complete verses and 8 badly broken ones. The main portion is by a single speaker. It is a tirade upon the faults of a person referred to as *οὗτος*. It is the senseless extravagance of the conduct of this person, rather than the moral reprehensibility of it, that outrages the speaker. The topics are logically arranged and lead up to a climax, in which the speaker puts himself in a most ridiculous light. The fellow 1) uses costly wines²—reason for consternation; 2) drunkenness was to be expected—but that is only bestiality; 3) he is wasting his patrimony—but he will have to pay the price; 4) he received a large dowry, but fails to recognize his obligation to his wife; 5) he pays a leno twelve drachmas a day—proof of utter incapacity for affairs, for a little reckoning shows that, at the rate of two obols a day for the keep of a man, this sum would support 36 men!

¹ One side, Kock *Men.* 520 and adesp. 114, published by Cobet, the other in Nauck, p. 157, and in Kretschmar, p. 111, who, however, does not speak of the Tischendorf fragment. The third strip contains on one side a few words of *Men.* Canephorus, on the other some Syrian script.

For Van Leeuwen's opinion of adesp. 105 see his note on Ep. 220 and Appendix, p. 165. He is convinced that the fragment is not to be assigned to the Epitrepontes.

² We must restore in the preceding verse *πίνει δὲ τιμώτατον* or something similar. In v. 4 *τοῦ ὀβο[λοῦ]*, which is confirmed by Jernstedt, indicates a rather high price for a cotyla of wine—three times the price of that furnished at Eleusis at the Choes, IG. II 834, b ii, 68. See Böckh-Fränkl *Staatshaushaltung* I, p. 123. I should not have questioned this restoration. *τὰ πατρώια* seems required in v. 7; if the reading *τὸν ἔρωτα* is correct the phrase is quite unusual but as appropriate for Charisius as for anyone.

We recognize in the speaker the traits of Smicrines, the λογιστικός (v. 483), and in the culprit, Charisius. The text is bad in places. The parchment was very difficult to read—Jernstedt testifies to this—and there were probably corruptions in the text. For example, both Tischendorf and Jernstedt give ἀπιστία in v. 3, where the true reading is unquestionably ἀπληστία, as Wilamowitz saw; cf. v. 2, possibly v. 7. But in general, now that the general situation is furnished by the relation of these verses to the Epitrepontes, the lines convey a consistent meaning from the beginning to the end. Toward the end we detect the approach of another person, in whom we recognize Chaerestratus, who is accompanied by Onesimus.

The connection between the end of R² and the beginning of the Tischendorf fragment is very close. In v. 7 of the latter Smicrines says πάλιν οἰμώζεται! Now it is difficult to explain πάλιν except on the assumption that Smicrines has a few lines before used the same phrase, hence [οὐκ οἰμώξ]εται in R², 4. πάλιν is therefore equivalent to "Again, I say". In R² Smicrines alone is speaking; he is also alone in the first sixteen verses of the Tischendorf fragment. The catalogue of Charisius' excesses with which the Tischendorf fragment begins follows up very satisfactorily the threat with which R² ends. The two fragments would join one another with a very slight interval.

The Jernstedt fragment, in which we see Smicrines, Chaerestratus, and Onesimus, brings the Act to a close; the Tischendorf fragment, in which Smicrines is joined by Chaerestratus and Onesimus, must have belonged to the same Act as the first part of the Jernstedt fragment. The last scene of the Act begins with v. 16 of the Tischendorf fragment, and approximately 14 verses intervened between the two. The twelve verses of R¹, in which Chaerestratus and Smicrines are conversing, would appropriately be placed, as we have seen, just before the Jernstedt fragment, that is, in the interval between it and the Tischendorf fragment. It follows that R², in which Smicrines alone speaks, would precede the Tischendorf fragment by an interval of about four verses, and, as we have seen, the subject-matter of both fragments is also favorable to this combination. Now R² is the verso of the papyrus, and since Körte has found that the leaves of the codex were arranged in the fashion of a parchment codex, verso facing verso and recto recto, it follows that R² was on either p. 11

or p. 15 of the quaternion, R¹ on the following page. Now NT¹ was at the top of the thirteenth page and NT² at the top of the fourteenth page. R², therefore, cannot be placed on the same page with NT¹, because the Tischendorf fragment, according to our supposition, follows it after a very short interval and the position of NT² would make this impossible. Besides, there must be room between NT¹ and NT² for the initial speech of Smicrines and for the development of the Cook-Onesimus scene (above, p. 412). If the Smicrines-scenes contained in the fragments R²-Tisch.-R¹-Jern. belong to Act III (and this is highly probable), they must be placed after NT², beginning on the fifteenth page of the quaternion. It is likely that Act III ended very near the end of the quaternion.

In the foregoing discussion no attempt has been made to justify Van Leeuwen's assignment of the Jernstedt fragment to the *Epitrepontes*, but only to show that, assuming that he is right in this, the recto of the same leaf must also be from this play and that in this case the two passages must be assigned to a definite position in the play. Restored in accordance with this hypothesis—and the general tenor of the context leaves little doubt as to the purport of the lost words—the two passages fit admirably into the remains of the papyrus text. It may be well, however, to summarize briefly the positive indications which support the proposed identification. We must of course bear in mind that absolute certainty in the assignment of any fragment to a particular play is unattainable so long as the actual physical connection is lacking. A number of isolated quotations have been attributed to one or another of the new plays by various scholars because of the coincidence of a single proper name in a context that is conceivably appropriate; and no one is disposed to question this procedure. But we must not forget that Menander uses the same names repeatedly (Körte, *Arch. f. Pap.* IV 523, note) for characters of the same type and that similar elements enter into the plots of different plays. In the case of so important an identification as that with which we are here concerned, it is right to demand something more in the way of proof than the mere coincidence of one or two proper names and of a general situation.

In these two passages (which we must treat as one continuous passage with a break of some fourteen verses) we have the two

proper names Chaerestratus, due to a probable restoration,¹ and Charisius. Of the former we learn that the father of a certain woman is awaiting him, and it is probably he who engages in the altercation which is in progress at the beginning of the verso. Of the second person, Charisius, we learn at first only that two persons, evidently Chaerestratus and companion, repair to his house to inform him of the arrival of a third person. Five other characters are indicated but not mentioned by name: 1) The father of the woman, the one who waits for Chaerestratus and at once enters into a hot quarrel with him about a third person (τοῦτον), has been inveighing against an extravagant and dissolute person who neglects his wife and patronizes a leno. Since he goes in to consult his daughter before determining upon the measures to be taken against him, it is clear that the daughter is the neglected wife and that the person whom he has been denouncing, first to the audience and then to Chaerestratus, is his son-in-law. 2) The person denounced, whom we have identified as the son-in-law, is clearly the Charisius whom Chaerestratus and the other propose to inform of the arrival of his angry father-in-law. 3) The person who introduces the father of the neglected wife (if the restoration $\delta\ \tau\eta\varsigma$ [νέας νύμφης π]ατήρ is correct) seems to be the slave of Charisius. He also stands in a close relationship of some sort to Chaerestratus (γλυκύτατε). He dislikes the father-in-law and is eager to aid Charisius. After the choral performance he avows his loyalty to his master (οἷός περ ἦσθα, πιστός in Q¹) and expresses his dislike of the "old man" in lines that are quoted as Menander's; viz., 581 and 836 K. 4) We have an allusion to the ψάλτρια, whom the father-in-law seems to refer to as in some way associated with his daughter's unhappiness. Doubtless she is the person for whose possession Charisius is paying large sums to the leno. 5) Lastly there is the neglected wife, whose dowry is endangered by the excesses of her husband. Now these six characters recur in the Epitrepontes in precisely the same relations to each other, involved in precisely the same situation, and characterized by the same

¹ V. 16 is unmetrical if Kock reports the initial lacuna exactly, but the difficulty is removed if we assume a space of some 6 letters instead of 4; e. g., [ὁρῶ τιν'] ὅς [σε] προσμένει, Χαιρ[έστρατε]. Nauck's report of Jernstedt suggests the following restoration of the words of the father-in-law, who has not yet seen Chaerestratus and the slave: [καὶ νῦν ἔχει τιν' ὁ] τρισκακοδ[αίμων ψάλ]τριαν, [τῇ τ' οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦ]σαν γυναῖκα [βούλεται], etc.

traits, so far as these are defined in the forty lines of the Jernstedt fragment: Chaerestratus the father, Charisius his son, Onesimus the slave of Charisius, Pamphila the neglected wife, Habrotonon the music-girl and mistress of Charisius, Smicrines the stingy and blustering father-in-law—while the names of two of them coincide. The chorus also, as we have seen, is the same in the play as in the fragment. These points of agreement are too numerous to be set aside as mere coincidences, and we shall see that in matters of plot and scenic arrangement also there is the closest harmony. It is important to observe further that the parchment fragments do not furnish a single new fact that is inconsistent with those derived from the papyrus remains of the Epitrepontes. We shall accordingly treat the parchment passage as belonging to this play beyond all reasonable doubt.

The Jernstedt and Tischendorf fragments bring some welcome information as to the scenic arrangements of the play. Since a correct understanding of these is essential to an appreciation of the legal aspects of the Charisius-Pamphila divorce case, and since the Attic law regarding the breaking of the marriage tie furnishes the clue to the interpretation of the course pursued by Charisius and Smicrines, we turn first to the disposition and identity of the houses represented in the scene.

There is first of all the house in which Charisius and Pamphila lived together before Onesimus discovered and divulged to his master the birth of a nothos by Pamphila. We must find out whether either Charisius or Pamphila has left this house, or whether they both are still living there, estranged. Chaerestratus is the proprietor of a house represented in the scenery. Here Syrus and his wife stay (vv. 160, 188, 194) until the monthly *ἀποφορά* shall have been paid over to Chaerestratus. In v. 194 Syrus casually remarks that Onesimus is staying at the same house; this brings Charisius too into the house of Chaerestratus. Now Chaerestratus has been rightly identified as the father of Charisius by Van Leeuwen and Robert. Are we to assume, with Robert, that Charisius and his wife make their home in the house of the father of Charisius? In that case we should have to assume that Smicrines also has a house in this deme and that Pamphila has left her husband and is staying there. But the new fragments make this supposition impossible. The situation is made still more difficult by the fact that Habrotonon also seems to be living in the house of Chaerestratus, for in v. 246 she speaks

as if she had seen Syrus' wife nursing the child within and comments on the baby (ὡς κομψόν, τάλαν); cf. also v. 315. But would Charisius, the impeccable (H², v. 429), bring a mistress into his home, even if his wife were not living with him, and receive his father there? We mistake his character wholly if we regard him as another Alcibiades. It must be acknowledged, however, that the house of Chaerestratus, with its motley array of residents and guests, seems more of a hostelry or public house than the residence of a country gentleman.

Now when Smicrines leaves the scene at the end of Act III (Jernstedt frag.) he goes in to see his daughter. Chaerestratus and Onesimus depart a moment later πρὸς Χαρίσιον, to tell him of Smicrines' arrival. These three clearly go into two different houses. When Smicrines is out of hearing Chaerestratus, still ruffled by the conversation which he has just had with him, says: "The skunk! He is breaking up the home!" Onesimus replies: "I wish he were breaking up a number of them while he is at it". "What do you mean"? asks Chaerestratus, to which Onesimus answers: "I mean yours, for one—the one next door". Now the home which Smicrines is disturbing is that of Charisius and Pamphila, while "the one next door" belongs to Chaerestratus, though he does not live there. The latter is easily identified with the house of Chaerestratus which Syrus with wife and baby, Onesimus, Habrotonon, Charisius and his troupe of guests (the chorus), and Chaerestratus himself make their headquarters. So when Smicrines goes into a different house to see his daughter, it must be either 1) a house of his own which for some reason he maintains in this deme, where Pamphila is living at present, or 2) the house of Charisius, where Pamphila continues to live after Charisius has moved to the other house. In either case Charisius and Pamphila are not now living together.

The question which we must now consider is therefore simply this: Is it Pamphila or Charisius who has left the home? If it is Pamphila, then their home has been the property of Chaerestratus and the second house is that of Smicrines. If, on the other hand, it is Charisius, the two houses are those of Charisius and his father Chaerestratus—and against this latter, be it remembered, Onesimus has some grudge. He heartily wishes that it could be cleaned out (ἀνάστατος). And yet he is living there with his master.

Two passages which undoubtedly gave clear testimony in this question happen to be corrupt. In one (v. 354) Onesimus seems

to say that, in a certain contingency, Pamphila will be forced by Charisius to leave him. In another (M²) Onesimus seems to tell Davus that Charisius has not sent Pamphila away. But in view of the uncertainty of the context in these passages they would best be left out of consideration at present; their restoration will be in harmony with the facts as they may be deduced from textually certain passages. Fortunately we have one bit of direct testimony. In the Tischendorf fragment we are expressly told that Charisius neglects his wife and οἰκίας ἀποκοιτός ἐστι.¹ Where he spends his nights, there we may assume that Habrotonon lives, and there too the revelling youth who form the chorus resort for their carousals. We shall understand its peculiar character if we assign it to the leno, rented by him from Chaerestratus. It is for the freedom of this house and for Habrotonon that Charisius is paying the leno twelve drachmas a day.

That the leno's house is represented in the scenery is made certain by vv. 213 ff. As Habrotonon comes out of the door at her first appearance a number of young men torment her and try to detain her. "Let me go, I beg of you, and stop annoying me!" she exclaims. Such a scene would be impossible in a respectable house. We now understand why Onesimus curses this house; his master lives there without the slightest attempt at concealment, rendering the domestic situation worse than ever. Onesimus knows, I think, what his master's reasons for this conduct are. As we shall see, Charisius is carrying out a deliberate and well-considered plan.

There is no reason to assume the presence of a third house. Smicrines visits his daughter at her home, which she has not left in spite of her grievous fault and her husband's manifest determination to have nothing to do with her. During the action of the play her house is little frequented. Sophrona her nurse² comes and goes and Smicrines visits her in the first Act and again in the third, perhaps also in the fourth. But when he returns in the fifth Act determined to take her away once for all,³ he is met at

¹ The argument is not affected if οἰκέτην proves to be the correct reading here.

² ἄμμία in M² settles her relationship. Wilamowitz saw it from the first, N. Jahr., 1908, p. 52.

³ Smicrines has so loudly proclaimed to all concerned that he proposes to take Pamphila away that all know, when he returns in Act V, that he is planning an ἄρπασμα. This is the meaning of Onesimus in v. 484 (H³), τό θ' ἄρπασμ', Ἡράκλεις, θανμαστὸν οἶον!

the door by Onesimus. Charisius has returned to his home καὶ ἄπαντ' ἀγαθὰ (H⁴, vv. 523, 531).

It cannot be denied that the situation in the family of Charisius which the preceding discussion has disclosed is just the contrary of what we should naturally have expected. The guilty wife remains in her husband's house, the husband goes away. And yet only such a situation will explain the state of mind in which we see Smicrines. If Charisius had already sent Pamphila away from his home, repudiating her as his wife, the divorce would have been legally accomplished by his act, and Smicrines would have been entitled to the dowry without making a disturbance—unless, indeed, Charisius might have resisted the claim for repayment by proving that Pamphila was not a virgin when he married her. And we know of no such provision in Attic law. But in the situation which the play discloses Smicrines is eager to take Pamphila away (H³, vv. 466, 481; H⁴, v. 504, and probably R²) and to get back the dowry. From the attitude of Smicrines alone, therefore, we might know that it is Charisius, and not Pamphila, who has left the home.

It has been consistently assumed by us in the foregoing discussion that Charisius has deliberately chosen a plan of conduct that will force his wife to leave him, and that in forming this plan he has counted upon the avarice of Smicrines to bring Pamphila to such a decision. This view is so opposed to the prevailing interpretation of the character of Charisius that further reasons must be given for holding it. It is generally supposed that Charisius is trying to drown his grief by dissipation or that he has taken up with the music-girl to spite his wife. The latter idea is hardly tenable unless we assume also that he is looking forward to a reconciliation after Pamphila has been sufficiently punished. But there is no indication whatever of any such design. He recognizes later (H², vv. 443 ff.) that he had been harsh and unfeeling in dealing with her; he had had no thought of forgiving her; his decision was irrevocable (v. 418, οὐδ' ἔδωκα συγγνώμης μέρος οὐθέν). There is something to be said for the other interpretation—that he is deeply grieved and seeks comfort in wine and women—in that this would be a natural thing to do. But there is also much to be said against it. His relations with Habrotonon have been chaste;¹ in her view, he is wasting his

¹ Unless we assume that the situation is of more than three days' duration. But this is probably the third day after Charisius' discovery.

money (vv. 220 ff.). Again, when we see him after his discovery that he too is responsible for an illegitimate child, he is overwhelmed with the realization of the false position into which he has put himself, for one who has been a very model of propriety and of honor (v. 430). We can hardly avoid the impression that his present conduct is based upon a definite calculation of a certain result that seems to him worth the temporary sacrifice of his reputation—a separation that will not require the disclosure of the true reason. That means the return of the dowry, of course. So chivalrous a motive is not, I think, to be regarded as alien to the poet who conceived the character of Habrotonon.

Let us glance for a moment at the legal situation. In Attic law the technical term for the repudiation of the wife by the husband is ἀποπέμπειν, for a separation by the act of the wife ἀπολείπειν. Menander is cited by the grammarians as observing the correct distinction between these terms, Bekk. Anec., p. 431, 6: 'ἀπέλιπε' μὲν ἡ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα λέγεται, 'ἀπέπεμψε' δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν γυναῖκα. οὕτω Μένανδρος.¹ It is possible that the quotation was taken from the Epitrepontes, for the situation was undoubtedly explained in the prologue. Now we do find in the prologue the word [ἀποπέ]μπειν (M², v. 10), and in H², v. 354, ἀπολείπειν is used—both words no doubt in the technical legal meaning. These passages and the fact that Charisius has not taken the ordinary and easy course of ἀπόπεμψις justifies us in looking for a full explanation in the provisions of Attic law. If the play were preserved complete our knowledge of the law of the subject would be considerably more definite in certain respects.

Either husband or wife could secure a separation on any grounds whatever, the husband by formally, i. e., probably always before witnesses, sending his wife away from his home.² The wife, on the other hand, was obliged to appear in person before the archon and to file with him a written notification (ἀπογράφεσθαι τὴν ἀπόλειψιν πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα). We do not know whether or not the reasons alleged had to be satisfactory to the magistrate to make the separation legally effective. Either party seems to have had the right to a trial by recourse to a δίκη ἀποπέμψεως or ἀπολείψεως respectively. Whichever party took the initiative the dowry went back to the wife's κύριος, except possibly

¹ Cf. p. 201, 22 ἀπόλειψις . . . ἰδίως δὲ ὅταν γαμετῇ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀπολείπη καὶ χρηματίζῃ πρὸς ἄνδρα ἀπόλειψιν.

² Meier-Schömann-Lipsius, Att. Proc. II, pp. 519 ff.

in the case of repudiation by the husband on the ground of infidelity or perhaps unchastity before marriage. On this point there is a difference of opinion among modern authorities and a total lack of evidence for Athens in the classical period.¹ The few authors of a late period who touch on the subject assume that the husband retains the dowry if his wife is put away for adultery. While we may suspect that this is the underlying presumption in the *Epitrepontes*, yet we shall do well to leave Charisius' possible claim, in case he had taken the initiative, entirely out of consideration in discussing the plot.

Quite apart from the question of the dowry, which he does not desire to keep, Charisius has a sufficient motive in giving Pamphila an opportunity and an excuse for leaving him. He loves her sincerely and deeply regrets that the knowledge of her unworthiness, as he considers it, was brought to him by his meddling slave (v. 207). To call in witnesses and before them formally to dismiss his wife would have been to expose her to the infamy that was attached to an unchaste woman. When, even after he has told her of his irrevocable decision no longer to regard her as his wife, she does not leave his house, Charisius decides that his only hope is in Smicrines, whose meanness he knows. He enters upon a course of life that is bound to arouse in Smicrines grave fears for the security of the dowry. Smicrines acts as he is expected to. But the plan did not reckon upon the unflinching love, greater because of her remorse, of Pamphila.

What reason does Pamphila give her father for her refusal to leave Charisius? Verse 442 (end of H²) gave the reason in an indirect quotation by Charisius, but the first part of the verse is lost. All attempts at restoration have been based upon the assumption that she now knows, as well as Smicrines, that Charisius also has an illegitimate son, and that this is the ἀνύχνημα

¹ Lipsius l. c., n. 114, dissents from the opinion of Gans and Schömann, "dass der Mann, wenn er mit Grund seine Frau verstieß, die Mitgift behielt", holding that the dowry was the property of the κίριος, and that he should not be made to suffer by the fault of his ward. In Hermann-Blümner *Gr. Privatalt.*, p. 265, the general statement is barely qualified, "vielleicht nicht einmal den Fall des Ehebruchs abgerechnet". Caillemer in *Dar.-Sagl. s. Divortium*, p. 320, thinks that the husband retained the dowry in such a case; that though there is no evidence for Athens in the classical period, it is true of a later time in Greece and is supported by the analogy of Ephesus, Ditt. *Syl.* 344, 59. The late writers who touch on the question are Sopater VIII, p. 229 Walz, Libanius IV p. 582 Reiske, Achil. Tat. 8, 8.

which she must loyally bear with him. But this cannot have been the case.¹ If she had known the truth she would have welcomed it as an *εὐτύχημα*, for with the knowledge that her husband had been guilty before marriage of the same offense as she and was now likewise embarrassed by a nothos, she would have been able to look forward with some confidence to an ultimate reconciliation. The fact of Charisius' error was not disclosed even to her father until toward the end of the play (v. 515), and to her by Charisius himself as soon as he learns the truth from Habrotonon (after Q¹). The nine missing letters should be restored to the following effect:

κοινωνὸς ἦκειν τοῦ βίου,
 <πάντως ἄρ'> οὐ δεῖν τἀτύχημ' αὐτὴν φυγεῖν
 [τὸ συμβε]βηκός.

The misfortune was her own; to flee it of her own accord (*αὐτὴν*) she would have to leave her husband's house (*ἀπολείψει*), as Smicrines insisted she should do. And to this she will not consent. In the same sense the corrupt verse 354, in which *ἀπολείπειν* is alone certain, must also be interpreted and restored.

Chaerestratus appears again in Q¹, a short fragment of nine verses coming from the bottom of a page. Apart from the restoration of his name in v. 2, which may be considered doubtful,² several other indications point directly to him. The person addressed is told that some third person has urged Onesimus to remain loyal to Charisius; that Habrotonon is not to be considered a common woman or an hetaera; then something about her part in identifying the baby; then the urgent appeal *ἐλευθέρου*.³ The speaker must be Onesimus and the person to be freed Habrotonon. It

¹ Charisius, after he has overheard the interview, conceives of Fate as saying to him in vv. 436 ff.: *δείξω σε, χρήσεται αὐτή, ἐπιδειχθήσεται*—all futures pointing to the ultimate disclosure to Pamphila of his equal guilt.

² I do not think it is, though it seems to exceed the space slightly. I am glad to yield the credit for this restoration to Sudhaus, whose article in *Rh. Mus.* (1908, p. 301) has just reached me.—Körte now reports that the first letter is X and that the restoration is certain.

³ Lefebvre's *ἐλεύθερος* cannot be construed with *παιδάριον* nor with anything else in the context. It must be changed to the imperative. What follows supports this view of the passage. Körte's reading in v. 5, *σπονδῇ* for Lefebvre's *νιού δῆ*, relieves a serious textual difficulty. After *παιδάριον* Körte reports σ or ε, then κμ or κω (very uncertain). σ and the combination εκω are both excluded by the metre. No verb *ἐκμεμ-* seems suitable to the sense, which would be satisfied by *σπονδῇ δὲ καὶ παιδάριον ἐ<ξήνρηκέ σοι>*.

has been a part of the plan of these conspirators that Habrotonon should gain her freedom if the plan succeeded (vv. 321, 341) and that Onesimus should have some reward, not stipulated, if Habrotonon could give it to him (vv. 326, 345). The scheme has now been carried through successfully and the time has come for the distribution of the rewards—first to Habrotonon, by the intercession of Onesimus, then to Onesimus, probably through the intercession of Habrotonon. It may be suspected that the compensation of Onesimus is the hand of Habrotonon. So much stress has been laid upon her chastity (vv. 262, 221) at the present time, and Onesimus asserts it with so much ardor here and at the end of the scene (top of H³),¹ that we feel as if some such arrangement were being prepared for earlier in the play and consummated here. Onesimus is smitten with her charms in M². $\pi\delta\epsilon$ in v. 2 indicates that Habrotonon is present during this scene.

To the continuation of this scene belongs Men. fr. 849 K., which Wilamowitz, Legrand and others recognized as belonging to the Epitrepontes. In granting the favors for which Onesimus had asked Chaerestratus says:

Chaer.: $\phi\iota\lambda\omega\ \sigma',\ 'Ον\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\mu\epsilon,\ <\epsilon\iota>\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}.$

If the quotation formed a single verse a syllable is lacking. Knowing as we do the meddling tendencies of Onesimus, the declaration "I like you, Onesimus" would hardly be without some qualification regarding his besetting sin. Fr. 850 K., which comes from the same context, may be from a lecture of Chaerestratus on the dangers of meddling, or from the excuse of Onesimus, probably the latter:

$\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau'\ \epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota.$

After H² there is a long break in the papyrus. H³ must be separated from H² by four pages. If a longer lacuna were assumed only two and one-half pages would be left for the early scenes in Act IV, in which Onesimus, Habrotonon, the Cook, and Sophrona, if not still others, take part, that is between $\chi\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ in the Jernstedt fragment and H¹. In the four-page interval between H² and H³ falls Q. It is generally supposed that Q¹ precedes Q², but as soon as we recognize in the former a conversation between Onesimus and Chaerestratus in which Onesimus pleads for the liberty of Habrotonon, we see that this scene must

¹ V. 462: "... and she must be chaste, else he (Charisius) would not have kept his hands off so charming a woman. And shall I?" (reading $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \delta'\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$);

follow Q^2 , in which Habrotonon accomplishes the service to Charisius on which her claim to a reward rests. Further, H^3 begins with the concluding lines of a speech by Onesimus which clearly follows his interview with Chaerestratus; the subject is Habrotonon. And finally, as Körte has recently pointed out, since Q came from the bottom of the leaf it would have to be placed on pp. 9-10 of the quaternion if the verso followed the recto in the codex, and this would make H^3 a direct continuation of Q^2 , which is impossible. Q^2 Q^1 must therefore be assigned, with Körte, to pp. 7, 8 of the quaternion.¹

Fragment M, which contains scanty remains of eighteen verse-beginnings and verse-ends on recto and verso respectively, was thought by Wilamowitz N. Jahrb., 1908, p. 62, to belong to the Epitrepontes, and Robert goes so far as to print it between NT^1 and NT^2 . Recognizable words which occur in it certainly suggest strongly this identification. But absolute certainty can be reached and M be made available for the reconstruction of the play only by the discovery of some new piece of papyrus that fits it or by the coincidence with some portion of M with a quotation that is already identified. Happily two of the verse-ends of the verso coincide, I believe, with the ends of the two full verses of Men. 600 K., which Croiset rightly assigned to the Epitrepontes. Wilamowitz surmised that 600 K. came from the exposition, and if the identification here suggested is correct, his conjecture is abundantly confirmed.

In v. 6 of the verso the restoration $[\psi\alpha\lambda]\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ is certain. The word is used of Habrotonon by the questioner of Onesimus in 600 K. and in Tisch. v. 20. $\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ v. 8 could hardly be filled out otherwise than $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \gamma\epsilon$, giving another answer of the same kind as $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\upsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ in the quotation.³ Here we have the advantage of knowing from the Tischendorf fragment that four talents were precisely the amount of Pamphila's dowry. Above $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ we have the letters $\nu\omicron\ .\ .\ \sigma$, which coincide, so far as they go, with the end of the line above $\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\rho\iota\alpha\upsilon$ in frag. 600, viz. $[\theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}]\nu$, $\omicron[\nu\acute{\iota}]\sigma[\iota\mu\epsilon]$.² With the

¹ The correct position of Q between H^2 and H^3 was found by Lefebvre, and Legrand suspected that the order was Q^2 Q^1 . But the interpretation which he and others have given of Q^2 differs essentially from that here advocated.

² Lefebvre does not indicate that anything was written after σ . But in a number of cases we must assume letters after the last reported traces. In general the fact must be recognized that the first editor has reported with great fidelity what he saw.

³ The unusual anapaestic close as in Ar. Ran. 1203, 1227.

exception that we have the accusative in the quotation and the genitive here the remains of M² have all the appearance of being a portion of the same dialogue between Onesimus and his questioner as that from which the quotation is taken. The topics which the two speakers would be likely to follow appear in the verse-ends in due order: music-girl, dowry, exposure (I had thought of [διελέγ]χοντι δὴ before I had a theory), repudiation of the wife, the money again, punishment, the mistress separated from the house, the nurse, the dark-browed (or σύνοφρος) beauty. To place M² in the first Act seems necessary even if frag. 600 is not to be incorporated in it.

At first sight the discrepancy between the second verse of the quotation and v. 6 of M² may seem to place an insuperable objection in the way of the incorporation here proposed. But when we reflect upon the chances in favor of a departure from the original text in quotation, illustrated by numberless instances, this may seem to be a minor objection after all. Many times a passage is intentionally adapted to meet the needs of the user, or only the pertinent word or phrase is kept intact while the context suffers modification; and the usual dangers of corruption in the process of transmission are multiplied for the quotation.¹ Further in this quotation the line of which ψάλτριαν is the last word is already imperfect in all three of the writers where it is found. To remedy this error Wilamowitz and Leo have proposed to insert the article before the proper name. But this is only a provisional expedient and does not improve the diction of the passage. The article is not desired before Ἀβρότονον τὴν ψάλτριαν. The error lies deeper. Now the passage is quoted in the scholia to Arist. De interpretatione, and twice in the Rhetores Graeci ed. Walz as a good illustration of the rhetorical effect of a quick answer following upon the question. It is a stock illustration, used in the schools. The second verse was much more likely to be modified than the first or third because it was of no importance in the illustration, and further, if the verse were too suggestive in

¹Of the 23 quotations from the four new plays which are derived from Menander texts only 8 are verbally exact, and most of these are short quotations, ranging from single words to two and a half verses. The changes in six of the rest may be regarded as intentional adaptations rather than as careless quotations. Only three or four seem to be due wholly to errors of transmission. The substitution of single words is one of the vices of quotation; e. g., πονεῖν for ποεῖν in 722 K., εἰμί for κάθημαι in 920 K.

its phrasing it was likely to be modified intentionally on that account. When we consider these possibilities, the actual loss of a syllable, the coincidence in all but the final letter, and the remarkable suitability of the quoted passage to the dialogue in *M*², we are disposed to look with suspicion upon the colorless *ἔχων*. It has displaced a trisyllabic word whose presence rendered the passage less suitable for the lecture room. *ἐρασθεῖς* would satisfy all the conditions (cf. *Φρύνης ἐρασθεῖς* Timocl. fr. 23).

According to the cues furnished by the ends of the lines, which are more significant in a dialogue than in long speeches, the passage may be reconstructed somewhat as follows:

- M* 2. <Dav.: οὐχ ὁ τρόφιμός σου, πρὸς θεῶ>ν, 'Ο<νῆ>σ<ιμε>,
 6. <ὁ νῦν ἐρασθεῖς Ἀβροτόνου τῆς ψαλ>τρίας,
 <ἔγῃμ' ἔναγχος>; *Ones.*: πάνυ μὲν οὖν. *Dav.*: λέγο>υσι καὶ
 <ὅτι προῖκ' ἔλαβε πολλήν. *Ones.*: τάλαντα τέττ>αρά γε.
 <νόθον δὲ τὴν γυναικα διελέγ>χο(ν)τι δὴ
 10. <τεκοῦσαν οὐκ ἔδοξεν ἀποπέ>μπειν' ἵνα
 <ὁμῶς ἀπέλθῃ ἀπολάβῃ> τὰ χρήματα,
 <ταύτην ἔχει μισθωσάμενος. *Dav.*: δεῖ>νῆ (δ)ίκῃ
 <αὕτη 'στί! τοῦτό σου πυθέσθαι βοῦ>λομαι'
 <ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς ἥ γε δ>έσποιν' οἰκίας;
 15. <*Ones.*: οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἔτ' οἴκοι καταμένει μετ' ἀ>μίας.
 <καλὸν τὸ γύναιον τοῦτο,> νῆ τὸν ἥλιον!
 ταύτην ἐγὼ
 μελάνο>φρυς.

9. *χουτιδῆ* pap.—10. Colon before *ἵνα* in pap.—12. *λικῆ* pap.—14. Colon after *οἰκίας* pap.—15. Hesych., E. M. s. *ἄμμία*. *μήτηρ*, *τροφός*, cf. Herond. 1, 7.—18. *μελάνοφρυς* Hesych. Possibly *σύνοφρυς*, cf. Theoc. 8, 73.—In *M*¹ read in 4. *ὀληται*, 10. *πλέον ἢ*, 11. *αὐτὸν διαλύσαι πρὸς*.—Körte, Ber. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss. LX, p. 131, reports *σιμμιος*, Lefebvre could make out only *μμίας*. If Körte is right the fragment cannot be assigned to this play. But appearances are strongly against Körte's reading, which should be verified.

Who is the interlocutor of Onesimus in this scene? There are only three possibilities, in my opinion: Smicrines, a *πρόσωπον προτατικόν*, or Davus. Syrisus is excluded by the fact that he and Onesimus do not know each other in the second Act (v. 177). The Cook has not yet arrived (v. 166). The subject matter excludes Smicrines. The poet would not have used a protatic character if one of the other characters was available. Now Davus is present in the next Act, though the motive for his

appearance is unknown. If he participated in the first Act his presence in the second would be self-explanatory. He was passing through the deme on some errand not connected with Charisius or his household. He meets Onesimus, who is about to go to the city to engage a cook. The two are old friends and stop to gossip. Then Davus proceeds on his errand. On his return journey he falls in with Syrisus in front of the house of Chaerestratus, and their quarrel and the arbitration follow.

Smicrines is also present in Act I. When we first see him in Act II (v. 5) he has just come from his first interview with his daughter. He too probably talked with Onesimus in the first Act. Certain words in M¹ point to him as the speaker; e. g., he complains of Charisius (*ἄσχατος, πίνειν*), but does not regard the quarrel as serious; he hopes to effect a reconciliation (*αὐτὸν διαλ- <ῦσαι (-ω) πρὸς θυγατέρα Παμφίλην>*). Onesimus does not tell him all he knows—about Habrotonon, the daily banquets with expensive cooks, the crowd of invited guests, etc. Smicrines learns about all these things later, when he has returned to the city (v. 362). We suspect that Davus, to whom Onesimus talked freely, repeated the gossip in town and that in this way it came to the ears of Smicrines after a time. This leads to the conjecture that M² preceded M¹, i. e., that Davus departed for the city before the arrival of Smicrines. Certainly it would seem more appropriate, from the point of view of dramatic structure, that the exposition, which is effected through the dialogue between Onesimus and Davus, should precede the arrival of Smicrines, whose errand introduced the action proper. In the interval of 18 verses between M² and M¹ we may assume that Davus takes his departure. The first words of Smicrines which are preserved (v. 2 of M¹) may be his first words after his entrance, and the speaker in the preceding verse is most likely Onesimus, who remains silent during the monologue that follows. A dialogue between Onesimus and Smicrines would then ensue. On this hypothesis, that the verso preceded the recto, the position of M would be on pp. 15–16 of the quaternion. The other possibility, pp. 11–12, would give undue length to the first Act. Since M is from the bottom of the leaf, some 25 verses of text preceded M²—either a brief monologue by Onesimus interrupted by the entrance of Davus, or a dialogue from the start, as in the *Heros*. The beginning of the *Epitrepontes*—title, hypothesis, personae, and a few lines of the text—would accordingly be on p. 14 of the quaternion.

With the facts in our possession we are now able to estimate somewhat more closely the extent of the play and of its main divisions. Without entering into a discussion of the various questions involved as regards the Epitrepontes or considering the relation of the Epitrepontes to the other plays in the Cairo papyrus, we give here what seems to be a plausible arrangement of the Acts¹ in the three quaternions through which this play ran, with greater detail in the portions which have been considered in this paper. For convenience these quaternions will be designated x, y, and z respectively.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPITREPONTES.

Epit. page.	Quat. page.	Contents.
Act I.		
1	x 14	Title, hypothesis, personae. Beginning of Act I. Enter Onesimus from house of Chaerestratus, Davus from the country. Sc. 1: Onesimus, Davus.
2	15	Sc. 1 continued. M ² .
3	16	Exit Davus to city. Sc. 2: Onesimus alone. Enter Smicrines from city. Sc. 3: Onesimus, Smicrines. M ¹ .
4	y 1	Sc. 3 continued. Exit Smicrines into house of Charisius. Sc. 4: Onesimus alone.
5	2	Sc. 4 continued. Exit Onesimus to city. End of Act I (ca. 133 vv.)* Enter from city Chorus of banqueters (?).†
Act II.		
5	2	Enter Syrus from country, Davus soon after from city. Sc. 1: Syrus, Davus.
6	3	Sc. 1 continued. Enter Smicrines from house of Charisius. Sc. 2: Syrus, Davus, Smicrines. D ¹ .
7-11	4-8	D ² , C ¹ , C ² , B ¹ , B ² . End of Act II (ca. 215 vv.). Enter Chorus (from house of Chaerestratus, or from the city†) after B ² , v. 19.
Act III.		
11-16	8-13	B ² (vv. 20 ff.), B ³ , B ⁴ , C ³ , C ⁴ , [D ²]=NT ¹ . Enter Smicrines from city. NT ¹ . Enter Onesimus and Cook soon after.
17	14	Onesimus and Cook. NT ² .
18	15	Smicrines alone. R ² and frag. Tisch. 1-16. Enter Chaerestratus and Onesimus.
19	16	Smicrines, Chaerestratus, Onesimus. R ¹ , frag. Jern. Exeunt omnes. End of Act III (ca. 302 vv.). Enter Chorus from house of Chaerestratus.

* If we assume a prologue by Onesimus before the entrance of Davus two more pages of quaternion x would be needed, making ca. 1200 vv. for the play.

† It is probable that there was no choral intermission between Act I and Act II; we are told in v. 195 that the guests (chorus) are arriving.

¹ While the justice of Legrand's contention *Rev. ét. anc.* 10, pp. 3 ff., must be acknowledged, that we have no authority for assuming that the Menandrian play was divided into five acts, yet the Epitrepontes does very naturally fall into five divisions.

Act IV.

- | | | |
|--------|-----|--|
| 20 | z 1 | Rest of fr. Jern. Enter Onesimus from house of Chaerestratus.
Sc. 1: Onesimus alone. |
| 21-23 | 2-4 | Lost. |
| 24, 25 | 5-6 | H ¹ , H ² . |
| 26 | 7 | Charisius, Onesimus, Habrotonon. Q ² . |
| 27 | 8 | At close of scene exit Charisius <i>into his own house</i> . End of
Act IV (?) (ca. 270 vv.). Enter Chorus from house of Chaeres-
tratus; at close of performance exit Chorus to city? |

Act V.

- | | | |
|--------|--------|---|
| 27 | 8 | Chaerestratus, Onesimus, Habrotonon. Sc. 1: these three. Q ¹ . |
| 28, 29 | 9, 10 | Lost. Exeunt Chaerestratus and Habrotonon. |
| 30, 31 | 11, 12 | Exit Onesimus into house of Charisius. Enter Smicrines from
city, Sophrona from house of Charisius. Enter Onesimus
from house of Charisius. H ³ . H ⁴ . |
| 32 | 13 | Lost. Exeunt omnes. End of Act V (ca. 200 vv.). End of play
(ca. 1120 vv.). |

EDWARD CAPPS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, August 10, 1908.